DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 607 RC 011 595

AUTHOR	Hickey, Anthony Andrew
TITLE	Decision-Making and Extra-Community Assistance to Rural Local Officials.
INSTITUTION	George Mason Univ., Fairfax, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Virginia State Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Richmond, Va.
PUB DATE	23 Aug 79
GRANT	ISP76-20175
NOTE	44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Burlington, Vermont, August 23-26, 1979); Not available in hard copy due to poor print quality of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Problems; Bureaucracy; Community Control; Community Leaders; *Decision Making; Development; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Financial Problems; *Government Role; *Local Government; Planning; *Rural Areas; Rural Economics; *Self Determination; State Aid; State Programs; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	Virginia

ABSTRACT

As rural communities strive to meet the demands of both their citizens and of higher levels of government for increased local services, they must rely more and more on outside assistance. The maze and complexity of federal and state mandates forces officials to seek technical assistance from a network of public and private agencies. The dynamics of this dependence was the focus of a study of eight rural localities in Virginia where local officials were questioned as to the decision making and technical assistance they received in such areas as fiscal planning and management. Areas in which help was most needed included (1) evaluation of the cost effectiveness of programs, (2) planning capital projects (including education and recreational facilities), (3) assistance in sewerage and water activities, and (4) determining future operating costs. Although dependent upon outside sources for both financial aid and planning assistance, the officials were concerned with the quality of assistance available and the strings that were sometimes attached. Sewerage and water development as mandated by the Environmental Protection Agency were seen as the most threatening interference from the federal sector. In order for local officials to preserve their independence and autonomy, they must become more proficient in dealing with higher levels of government; they must seek to modify and reinterpret bureaucratic regulations to secure maximum group benefit. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175607

Decision-Making and Extra-Community Assistance to Rural Local Officials

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anthony Andrew Hickey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Anthony Andrew Hickey
George Mason University

This research was funded in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant ISP76-20175 and the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, August 23-26, 1979 Burlington, Vermont

RC011595

Introduction

Roland Warren (1978:15) has written that one of the most general and serious problems facing communities in America today is "the inability (of the community) to organize its forces effectively to cope with its specific problems." He suggests that the conditions that create difficulties for local communities are found not in the local community but are problems of the larger society. Therefore in order to discover the dimensions of the difficulties of decision-making and implementation, one should not conceive of the community as a closed system but consider the linkages that exist between the community and the larger society which he terms "the community's vertical pattern." Associated with this vertical pattern of linkages is a barrier to effective community action related to the loss of community autonomy over organizations and institutions that make up the structure of the community. One such institution is the local government itself.

This paper is derived from a study of capacity-building gaps in rural Virginia that was funded by the National Science Foundation and implemented by the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Capacity-building gaps were defined as occurring when resources are not available to meet community needs. The study addressed both the demand by local citizens for improvements in community assistance and the delivery of services and the demands placed on local governments by higher

levels of government. The study recognized that rural communities are increasingly being required to design and implement programs mandated by state and federal agencies with inadequate resources and abilities. This general situation has been described as a set of "pincers" involving demands for increased services by both citizens and higher levels of government that is exacerbated by the diseconomies of scale associated with governing rural areas (Rainey and Rainey, 1978).

The purpose of this report is to describe decision-making and technical assistance in such areas as fiscal, planning, and management that the officials from eight rural localities indicated were problematic for them. These officials were asked to indicate the decision-making areas in which they felt they needed assistance and to evaluate the sources of assistance that were utilized. What emerged was a picture of a network of public and private agencies offering technical assistance that has a great impact on the effectiveness of local officials. We expected to find frustration with state and federal mandates that are often conflicting, confusing and impossible to implement. We did not expect to find the level of frustration with the network of assistors that existed among this group of officials. They felt that they were losing their ability to govern. On the one hand decisions were being made for them at higher levels of government and on the other hand they were dependent upon extra-community assistance over which they had little control. The issue of dependence will be addressed in this paper.

The description of the network of assistors will be developed from the consideration of the following questions: Who assists? In what areas is assistance needed and is the assistance available? What are the attitudes of the local officials toward the various assistors? What degree of dependence on extra-community assistance exists in these eight rural localities in Virginia.

Research that focuses on linkages between the local community and its environment is important to the understanding of the dynamics of rural community life but unfortunately is grossly underrepresented in the literature. As expressed by Hawley and Svara (1972:3):

> One of the greatest gaps in the literature on community power is the impact that extra-community forces--especially county, state and federal governments--have on local patterns of decision-making.

Community Autonomy

The concept of community autonomy has been developed by Roland Warren as a continuum of the degree to which communities have control over events and activities that occur within the locality (Warren, 1956b). Warren has delimited seven dimensions of autonomy that involve subjective feelings of residents, cultural facilities, absentee ownership of community activities, decision-making loci, organization of institutionalized services lines of redress for grievances and affiliation of functional units with extra-community facilities (Warren, 1956a:339). He suggests that some communities are autonomous in that they are able to solve their own problems while other communities are dependent upon extra-community forces for their survival.

The concern of this research is with governmental autonomy which touches many of these dimensions, particularly the latter four. In discussing extra-community governmental controls, Warren suggests that regulation is the primary source of the loss of autonomy. This research would suggest that although regulation represents control over governmental activities, the dependence of local officials on an extra-community network of technical assistance providers also represents the possibility of loss of autonomy.

George Hillery (1972) discusses this point by suggesting that there exists a negative relationship between autonomy and viability:

> Warren shows the plausibility of several relationships: As community autonomy increases, relative to the outside world, the base of community power becomes narrower (that is, it becomes less 'democratic') and there is a decrease in viability (the ability of the community to solve its own problems) (Hillery, 1972:542-43).

This statement has interesting implications for this study. If a community finds itself in a position of obtaining technical assistance from an extra-community agency, it sacrifices autonomy for viability. This of course depends upon the type of assistance available (i.e. the number of strings) and the source of the assistance.[1] While complete autonomy may mean that decisions

---

[1] Hillery's statement provides an explanation for the fact that many officials had a love-hate feeling about extra-local assistance. They needed it but also felt frustrated because they were unable to solve their own problems.

are made by an isolated group of individuals, this report will focus on the relationship between autonomy and viability. Small rural governments, by utilizing extra-local assistance, may be trading autonomy for viability.

Another perspective on community autonomy is provided by Terry N. Clark (1973). It is his view that the autonomy of the local community is related to decentralization and Federalism. He defines autonomy as a continuum of "the proportion of community activities to be made by actors residing within the local community"(Clark, 1973:103). He argues that the appearance of very little autonomy is inherent in the American Federal system of organization of government. "Dillon's rule" states that communities may undertake only those functions that have been explicitly granted to them by state government (Walker and Walker, 1975:39). This rule serves to expand state involvement in local affairs through mandates, special enactments and the assumption of such local responsibilities as education, welfare and roads. Clark (1973) develops a number of propositions concerning the relationships between centralization, resource availability and autonomy. Centralization affects the amount of power given to local leaders and varies from state to state but autonomy within states depends upon the social and economic resources available to the local community as well as the skill and talent of local leaders. Clark's propositions are related to societal conditions and resources but do not suggest the dynamics of resource capabilities at the local level. From Clark's macro-level perspective, communities may maintain autonomy by utilizing

all resources available to the locality. This research suggests that the reliance of community officials on extra-community actors for guidance and technical assistance decreases the autonomy of the local community while increasing the viability of local government within the federal system.

Clark's perspective is useful in that it directs attention to the larger environment of the local government. Federalism as a structure and revenue sharing as a process have far reaching effects on the autonomy of local communities. The "New Federalism" is based on the principle of sharing power and authority (Reagan, 1972). While these policies have theoretically decreased federal control over local activities, researchers have suggested that a large proportion of federal (and state) aid to the local community still involves grants-in-aid or involves mandated programs (Manvel, 1975). It has also been argued that revenue sharing has questionable benefits given the fact that many local governments lack the administrative ability to plan for and utilize revenue sharing funds (Reagan, 1975).[2] The controversy over revenue sharing and Federalism is somewhat extraneous to this study except to suggest that the "New Federalism" has traded one mode of loss in autonomy for another mode. The concentration of power and decision-making under the "Old Federalism" meant that local government acted as an arm of the federal government with few responsibilities delegated

---

[2] For a general discussion of Federalism and revenue sharing see Caputo, 1975.

to it. Local government acts chiefly as a channel of communication between rural people and the central authority (Sanders, 1977:143). This same argument has been made about the growth of power at the state level (Dye, 1977:49). Under the "Old Federalism", the autonomy of the local community was determined by the fact that very few decisions were left to be made at the local level.

The "New Federalism" is designed to increase transfers through revenue sharing as a method of returning decision-making to the local level (Danielson, et al., 1977:118). Given that many rural communities have part-time officials and a limited pool of talent, as well as limited tax bases, the act of requiring local communities to develop comprehensive plans involving the implementation and evaluation of programs has created a new mode of loss of autonomy. Decision-making is being returned to the local community but the complexity of federal and state mandates and regulations have forced local officials to become dependent on extra-community actors for technical assistance. While autonomy has theoretically increased through revenue sharing, in actuality, they have gained very little. It also must be remembered that most state and federal aid is still tied to specific mandates and regulations which represent the "Old Federalism:"

> Nearly ninety percent of it (assistance to localities) is restricted to specific program areas...Also ninety to ninety-five percent of the money in these (areas) as well as in the miscellaneous category, is governed by formulas

> and conditions that allow little discretion (Walker and Walker, 1975:43).

The discussion of community autonomy so far has focused on societal influences on the local community but very little research has been concerned with the dynamics of how these influences operate. Vidich and Bensman's (1968) classic case study of Springdale provides many illustrations of the loss of autonomy. They argue that local officials adjust their actions to reflect externally defined rules and regulations in almost all areas of jurisdiction. They state:

> It is through a combination of these requirements and the acceptance of the aid that the local governing agency finds itself in a position of having surrendered its legal jurisdictions to outside agencies (Vidich and Bensman, 1968:113).

The officials of Springdale found themselves in the situation of having not only their activities and programs governed from outside but having their priorities warped by the availability of categorical aid. Dependence upon outside financial aid tends to reduce local initiative by becoming a major preoccupation of local officials (Rainey and Rainey, 1978:132).

Local governments, then, lose autonomy by becoming dependent upon state and federal aid. The maze and complexity of federal and state mandates have further decreased the autonomy of local governments by forcing officials to rely on technical aid from outside agencies. This is particularly true in rural areas given the scale of government and the lack of resources and skills available to local officials. The dynamics of

this dependence is the focus of this report.

The Study

Eight localities were chosen for this study. The following criteria were used to select the areas:

a) population - towns with less than 5,000 and counties with less than 15,000

b) demographic change - four categories were defined and equally represented:
   - growing through industrial growth
   - growing for other reasons (suburbanizing)
   - stable (within 5% change over 10 years)
   - declining

c) willingness of local elected and appointed officials to participate.

Four towns and four counties were selected according to the above criteria. While this approach does not represent a random sample, the comparative feature of the selection procedure is more critical than the ability to generalize to the whole of rural areas in Virginia. The eight localities included the counties of Powhatan, Lancaster, Sussex, Buckingham and the towns of Glade Springs, South Hill, Chatham and Woodstock. Glade Springs and South Hill represent areas growing through industrialization. Powhatan and Lancaster are areas growing for other reasons, namely, suburbanization for the former and retirement for the latter. Chatham and Woodstock are stable

while Sussex and Buckingham are declining in population.

The study was designed to approach an understanding of local government viability from two levels. The first was to interview local officials and the second was to determine community needs as perceived by leaders outside of government in the community. The motive for surveying at the two levels was that the question of viability of government may be perceived differently by officials and leaders and both perspectives are necessary. For this report we are interested in the data from the officials.

The study of government officials was designed to include all persons in policy-making and management roles, elected and appointed. Therefore, there was 100 percent inclusion of the population from the right localities. Interviews were taken with a total of 93 officials with the instrument including both closed and open-ended questions. The fieldwork was done during the summer of 1977.

Officials (and leaders) from the study areas were invited to seminars involving persons from local government throughout the rural portions of Virginia during the Spring of 1978. These seminars were designed to discuss the findings of the study and to draft policy recommendations for state officials. The discussions were very helpful in clarifying issues and stimulating cooperative efforts between state and local officials.

It should be noted that this report is utilizing a very broad definition of community to include both counties and towns.

This structural definition of community is, of course, open to question, but since governments are organized on these levels, no other definition would suit our purposes of describing the viability and autonomy of local government.

The Extra-Community Network of Assistance

The officials from the eight localities were asked to comment on ninety-eight governmental functions (See Appendix A). Specifically they were asked their perception concerning whether the functions or practices were: 1) handled with little or no assistance; 2) handled with assistance from the public sector; 3) handled by private firms; or 4) functions in which the local government needed more assistance than was currently available. Analysis of the data yielded the following generalizations about areas where the officials felt their capabilities were lacking.

1) One third of the officials expressed a need for assistance in evaluating the cost effectiveness of various programs. Town officials, relative to county officials perceived less need for additional assistance in this area. The greater scope of activities at the county level may account for this difference. Overall, officials expressed the need for more emphasis on evaluation of services, particularly in view of steadily increasing personnel and equipment costs.

2) The area of capital projects was reported to be problematic. This area included long run and expensive undertakings in the planning, construction and operation of sewerage and water systems, sanitary land fills, education and recreational facilities.

All towns were involved in the distribution of water and three operated sewerage systems. Counties were not operating such systems but were beginning to become involved as small towns and incorporated communities turned to counties for assistance in these areas. Officials reported great frustration with mandates and regulations from such agencies as the Environmental Protection Agency.

3) A majority of county and town officials stated that heavy reliance was placed on private firms for planning and engineering assistance in sewerage and water activities. One half of the county and a third of the town officials specifically expressed the need for assistance from the public sector to help them analyze and evaluate outside private consultant recommendations prior to making decisions on capital-type projects.

4) About one-fourth of the county and one-fifth of the town officials indicated more help was needed in determining future operating costs and increases from capital improvements in order to determine the kind of capital mix that should be developed to pay for the project. Other areas in which county officials, in particular, indicated a need for more assistance were: conducting feasibility studies; determining service potentials for projects; projecting manpower and skill needs; and preparing environmental impact studies.

5) Officials indicated that personnel administration and the budget process were not problem areas because state procedures were utilized. The maintenance of public property and

facilities were also reported to be handled adequately at the local level.

The expressed needs and the reliance on private firms reflect the lack of professional staff expertise in rural governments. Officials emphasized that any technical assistance offered by the public sector must be competent, aware of unique problems in rural areas and free of conflicts of interest. For capital projects, local officials expressed the need for an effective and coordinated technical assistance program on the part of state and federal agencies.

An index was constructed to measure the need for assistance as reported by the officials. Factor analysis and Nunnally's domain sampling model (Nunnally, 1967:175-89) were used to assess the validity and reliability of the index. Response categories were dichotomized to reflect need/no need and the following items were determined to be reliable and valid: sharing equipment, capital project feasibility, provision of services, kinds of programs necessary, use and cost of physical facilities, cost and revenue projections, manpower projections, environmental impact studies and the use of data in decision-making. The resulting index showed an alpha reliability of .88 and all items loaded on a single factor at .5 or greater. The index measures the needs of the local government as perceived by the officials. The index was submitted to analysis of variance with the following independent variables: demographic type of the locality, town vs. county, official's education, age, years in the community

and in the position. The only significant relationship that resulted was that the officials in the stable and declining localities reported more needs than those localities increasing in population. While this suggests that officials from growing communities perceived that they were in better shape, all localities reported a similar priority listing of community needs. Table 1 shows the needs priorities as reported by the officials.

Table 1: Priority of Needs

Need	RANKS Town Priority	County Priority
Engineering and public works	1	2
Industrial Development	4	1
Recreation	2	3
Education	5	5
Health and Welfare	9	6
Planning	14.5	4
Public Safety	14.5	8.5
Housing	3	7

There seems to be relative agreement among all the officials concerning what needs they think exist for their governments. It is clear that the first four needs are generalized in both towns and counties. We turn now to a description of the agencies that are available to assist these officials.

The officials were asked to evaluate the assistance provided by various agencies that offered technical and professional guidance. Table 2 shows the percentage reporting utilization of services and the percent rating the assistance favorable and unfavorable. The data is broken down by towns and counties as well as for the total number of officials.

(Table 2 about here)

Ninety-six per cent of all officials stated that assistance was received from planning district commissions (a Virginia state agency) in developing and updating comprehensive plans, subdivision and zoning ordinances, preparing applications for federal/state grants and loans and conducting feasibility studies. Although eight-nine percent rated the assistance favorable, many expressed concern that the commission had insufficient resources with which to respond to community needs.

The Extension Division of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, the Virginia Association of Counties, the Virginia Municipal League were other sources that were highly utilized. About eighty percent of the officials rated this assistance favorable.

The table reveals some interesting observations. Town officials utilized these sources of assistance less than the counties. This fact runs counter to the intuition that localities with less resources, human and otherwise, would use outside assistance more than the better off localities. However, the town officials who reported using the assistance tended to rate

the service better than the county officials. In meeting with the officials it became clear that many town officials were not "hooked into the system" as well as the county officials. It also suggests that the assistors were not visible enough to the smaller localities. Additionally it suggests that the county officials who have had more experience with the assistance had more opportunities to become disappointed.

The officials were asked to rate on a Likert scale the assistance available from state and federal sources in functional areas such as health, education, recreation, housing and so forth. Using factor analysis and Nunnally's domain sampling model of reliability the following indices were constructed:

Impressions of State Assistance	Impressions of Federal Assistance
Health	Health
Education	Education
Welfare	Welfare
Housing	Highway and Transportation
Equipment	Planning
Recreation	Water and Sewerage
Water and Sewerage	Pollution Control
Conservation and Land Use	Economic Development
Disaster	Conservation and Land Use
	Personnel and Training
Alpha = .78	Alpha = .78

It should be noted that counties received more federal and state assistance and services than did the towns. Most officials tended to consider federal and state assistance in a similar manner. This may be due to the intermingling of funding and services from federal and state sources.

Analysis of variance was again utilized to identify differences in means for demographic type and type of government as well as for the different personal characteristics of the officials themselves. For impressions of state assistance only two significant differences were found. County officials were more satisfied with state assistance and older officials from both towns and counties were more satisfied than younger officials. Age was broken into three categories: under thirty-one, thirty-one to fifty-one and over fifty-one. For impressions of federal assistance only one significant difference was found and that was that again county officials were more satisfied than town officials.

Conclusions and Implications

The data that resulted from the survey of officials from these eight rural Virginia localities are very rich in detail and difficult to analyze quantitatively. The study became almost ethnographic in mapping out governmental needs, functions, and frustrations. Some general conclusions however are very clear.

These rural governments cannot be viewed as isolated closed systems. The officials were very aware of the necessity of seeking assistance from outside the community. In a sense, then, they are dependent upon outside sources of assistance in order to maintain viability. They are however, concerned with the quality of the assistance available and the strings that are attached to some sources.

The data show that towns received less assistance than the counties. Some difference is attributable to the fact that counties are involved in more functional areas than the towns. Some difference is also attributable to the fact that small localities have less access to many sources of assistance. In Virginia, the Planning District Commissions are a key factor in the network of assistance to local government.

In terms of local governmental needs, there is agreement among the county and town officials. Fiscal needs were universal. Both town and county officials expressed concern that their tax bases were too small to provide the level of public services they felt were needed in their localities. All officials recognized their dependence upon federal and state funds.

The area of public works and capital improvements was also mentioned by most officials as problematic. Sewerage and water developments as mandated by EPA were seen as the most threatening interference from the federal sector. Officials from towns reported that EPA regulations required them to build facilities that were projected to cost up to one hundred times their annual budgets. Once the facilities were operating, personnel costs for these facilities were projected to equal their present personnel budget. Federal mandates represented topics that angered and frustrated the local officials that we interviewed, particularly in the smaller localities.

The picture that emerges is complex. Sociologists have often assumed that the local community is becoming dominated

by external actors (Vidich and Bensman, 1968; Stein, 1960). John Bennett, an anthropologist, sees the situation somewhat differently:

> It is important to recognize that local people do not necessarily accept the bureaucratic regulations passively, but seek to modify or reinterpret them in order to extract personal and group benefit (Bennett, 1967:447).

Independence and autonomy may be easy ways to conceptualize local government but Bennett sees a process of adaptation that involves manipulation by the locality of the larger bureaucratic government structure as well as dependence upon it. The active participation of officials in the survey and the follow-up seminars attests to the fact that they want to become more proficient in dealing with higher levels of government. Those who are concerned with the viability of rural government should orient their research toward this process of adaptation to insure that the assistance, both fiscal and technical, that is needed by localities is of a good quality and is available.

TABLE 2

Officials Evaluation of Help Provided by Sources of Professional and Technical Assistance

	% Utilization			% Rating Unfavorable			% Rating Favorable		
	T	C	TOTAL	T	C	TOTAL	T	C	TOTAL
Planning Districts	95	98	96	11	12	11	89	88	89
Assn. of Counties/ Municipal League	83	97	90	10	17	14	90	83	86
Community College	51	49	50	22	37	35	78	63	65
University/College	18	55	35	17	44	42	83	56	58
Extension Service	43	95	71	0	10	7	100	90	93
State Legislators	78	98	89	11	18	15	89	82	85
Federal Legislators	67	87	77	21	13	16	79	87	84

T = Towns

C = Counties

References

Bennett, John W.
1967 "Microcosm-Macrocosm Relationships in North American Agrarian Society." American Anthropologist, Vol. 69.

Caputo, David A. (Ed.)
1975 "General Revenue Sharing and Federalism," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Vol. 419, May.

Clark, Terry N.
1973 "Community Autonomy in the Federal System: Federalism, Localism and Decentralization," Social Science Information, Vol. 12(4), August.

Danielson, M.N., A.M. Hershey and J.M. Bayne
1977 One Nation, So Many Governments: A Report to the Ford Foundation. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Dye, Thomas R.
1977 Politics in States and Communities. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Farmer, Berkwood M., Anthony A. Hickey, Edward H. Hanson, Irl W. Smith and Mark H. Silverman
1978 "Capacity-Building Needs of Rural Areas in Virginia," Richmond: Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, September.

Hawley, Willis and James Svara
1972 The Study of Community Power: A Bibliographic Review. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO.

Hillery, George, Jr.
1972 "Selected Issues in Community Theory," Rural Sociology, Vol. 37(4), December.

Manvel, Allen D.
1975 "The Fiscal Impact of Revenue Sharing," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 419, May.

Nunnally, Jum C.
1967 Psychometric Theory. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.

Rainey, Kenneth D. and Karen G. Rainey
1978 "Rural Government and Local Public Services," in Rural USA: Persistence and Change. Thomas R. Ford (Ed.). Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Reagan, Michael D.
1972 The New Federalism. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

1975 "The Pro and Con Arguments," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 419, May.

Sanders, Irwin T.
1977 Rural Society. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Stein, Maurice R.
1960 The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Walker, Jeanne and David Walker
1975 "Rationalizing Local Government, Powers, Functions and Structure," in States' Responsibilities to Local Governments: An Action Agenda. Center for Policy Research and Analysis of the National Governors Conference, October.

Warren, Roland L.
1956a "Toward A Typology of Extra-Community Controls Limiting Local Community Autonomy," Social Forces, Vol. 34(4), May.

1956b "Toward A. Reformulation of Community Theory," Human Organization, Vol. 10 (Summer).

1978 The Community in America. Third Edition. Chicago: Rand McNally.

APPENDIX A.

Governmental Functional Areas

PART I.

	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	0	
	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help.	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost.	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis.	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available.	Local government body has no authority in this field.	Local government not involved in this activity.	Don't know	No answer.	No opinion.	Brief comments.
A. Government Organization										
1. Drafting charter, amendments, administrative rules and regulations.										
2. Internal organization and management studies.										
B. Financial and Administrative Planning Control and Implementation										
1. Preparation and administration of operating budget.										
1a. Utilization of budget as a management mechanism.										
1b. Procedures followed in budget preparation.										
1c. Determining budget priorities.										
1d. Providing flexibility into budget to handle unexpected situations.										
1e. Obtaining citizen participation in budget preparation.										
1f. Factoring federal and state mandates into local budget.										

24

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help. 1	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost. 2	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis. 3	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available. 4	Local government body has no authority in this field. 6	Local government not involved in this activity. 7	Don't know 8	No answer. 9	No opinion. 0	Brief comments.
1g. Auditing										
1h. Evaluating internal control procedures and accounting systems.										
1i. Determining effectiveness of various programs in accomplishing desired objectives in past year.										
1j. Other.										
2. Preparation and Marketing of Bonds.										
3. Purchasing.										
3a. Centralized purchasing										
3b. Use of specifications										
3c. Bidding procedures										
3d. Inventory control										
3e. Interjurisdictional purchasing arrangements and sharing of high cost equipment.										
4. Utility accounts, records, rate setting.										

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help.	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost.	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis.	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available.	Local government body has no authority in this field.	Local government not involved in this activity.	Don't know	No answer.	No opinion.	Brief comments.
	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	0	
5. Matters Relating to Insurance Coverage										
6. Capital Projects (short and long term)										
6a. Evaluating project as to its need and feasibility										
6b. Determining what services the project will be able to provide										
6c. Determining what kind of program activity will be required										
6d. Analyzing current inventories of physical facilities in terms of their relationship to cost and to capacity & use										
6e. Determining future operating cost and revenues from the capital improvement to determine financing "mix", i.e., current revenue, federal revenue sharing, users fees, long term debt, special assessments and state and federal grants										
6f. Projecting future manpower and special skill needs of project										

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help. 1	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost. 2	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis. 3	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available. 4	Local government body has no authority in this field. 6	Local government not involved in this activity. 7	Don't know 8	No answer. 9	No opinion. 0	Brief comments.
6g. Analysis and evaluation of outside recommendations concerning capital projects in terms of cost, engineering, phasing and appropriateness to stated purpose of the project										
6h. Conducting a referendum										
6i. Arrangements for liaison with concurrent and adjacent governmental units										
6j. Preparing environmental impact studies										
6k. Establishment and revision of capital improvement budgets										
6l. Relating the proposed capital project as to its conformity to comprehensive plan										
6m. Handling legal matters that relate to the project										
6n. Preparing applications for state and federal grants or loans										
7. Information gathering and analysis capacity										
7a. Handling and storing data										

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help. 1	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost. 2	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis. 3	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available. 4	Local government body has no authority in this field. 6	Local government not involved in this activity. 7	Don't know 8	No answer. 9	No opinion. 0	Brief comments.
7b. Use of available data in decision making										
7c. Use of electronic data processing for basic functions such as centralized purchasing, preparation of tax bills, water and sewer bills										
Building Codes										
1. Revision of local building codes to conform to state regulations										
2. Enforcement of building codes										
D. Planning										
1. Land use and comprehensive planning										
2. Specifically planning for agricultural land use										
3. Updating of comprehensive multi-year plan										
4. Developing and revision of zoning and subdivision ordinances										
5. Planning for land application of sludge and wastewater										

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help.	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost.	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis.	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available.	Local government body has no authority in this field.	Local government not involved in this activity.	Don't know.	No answer.	No opinion.	Brief comments.
	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	0	
E. Personnel Administration										
1. Recruitment policy										
2. Developing job classifications which are realistic to job requirements										
3. Determination of pay schedules										
4. Conforming personnel requirements for specific jobs to state standards										
5. Measuring employee productivity										
6. Establishing fringe benefits and impacts of such benefits on current and future budgets										
7. Employee development program-upward mobility										
8. Meeting requirements of Equal Opportunity Employment regulations										
9. Enforcing fair and uniform disciplinary procedures										
10. Conflict of interest rules										
11. Handling of employee appeals										

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help. (1)	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost. (2)	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis. (3)	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available. (4)	Local government body has no authority in this field. (6)	Local government not involved in this activity. (7)	Don't know (8)	No answer. (9)	No opinion. (0)	Brief comments.
12. Determining training needs										
13. Developing and using training guides										
14. Executive training of elected and top appointed officials										
15. Employee training to meet specific needs										
16. Training opportunities for volunteer workers										
17. Developing employee interchange programs with other government units										
18. Making decisions on using local governmental employees vs. contracting with private firms										
F. Intergovernmental Relations										
1. Keeping informed on federal and state programs affecting local jurisdictions										
2. Consolidation of services with other government jurisdictions through joint agreement										

30

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help.	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost.	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis.	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available.	Local government body has no authority in this field.	Local government not involved in this activity.	Don't know	No answer.	No opinion.	Brief comments.
	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	0	
G. Citizen Participation										
1. Keeping citizens informed of local government actions										
2. Conducting citizen participation forums and following up on recommendations										
3. Conducting public hearings										
4. Coordination and working relationships with advisory boards and commissions										
H. Special Issues - Administration, Supervision and Operations of Programs Related to:										
1. Public safety										
1a. Police										
1b. Fire prevention										
1c. Rescue squad										
1d. Overall coordination of public safety programs										
2. Engineering										
2a. Refuse collection and disposal										

39

40

31

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help. 1	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost. 2	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis. 3	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available. 4	Local government body has no authority in this field. 6	Local government not involved in this activity. 7	Don't know 8	No answer. 9	No opinion. 0	Brief comments.
2b. Water supply and distribution-engineering and planning										
2c. Water supply and distribution-maintenance										
2d. Sewage disposal and treatment-engineering and planning										
2e. Sewage disposal and treatment-maintenance										
2f. Street and road construction										
2g. Street and road maintenance										
2h. Building construction										
2i. Building maintenance										
2j. Airport construction										
2k. Airport maintenance										
2l. Garage - maintenance of equipment										
3. Health and Welfare										
3a. Public housing projects										
3b. Medical facilities										

41

42

32

	Handled by local govt. with local resources with little or no outside help. 1	Handled locally with readily available assistance from other than private firm at no or nominal cost. 2	Rely primarily or solely on private firm on fee basis. 3	Need outside help from other than private firm which is not now readily available. 4	Local government body has no authority in this field. 6	Local government not involved in this activity. 7	Don't know 8	No answer. 9	No opinion. 0	Brief comments.
3c. Physically handicapped										
3d. Mentally handicapped										
3e. Assistance to underprivileged										
3f. Youth counselling										
3g. Assistance to aged										
3h. Other										
4. Parks and Recreation										
4a. Land acquisition										
4b. Community center										
4c. Park management										
5. Educational and Cultural										
5a. School curricula										
5b. School facilities										
5c. Library operation										
5d. Other										
6. Economic Development										
6a. Economic planning studies										
6b. Promotion to stimulate more industry to area										